

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-46 are pending and rejected. No claim has been canceled. Claims 1, 20, and 24-28 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-15, 17-42, and 44-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KIVA "Developing KIVA Applications" (KIVA), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,310 of Yost et al. ("Yost"). Claims 16 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KIVA in view of Yost and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,847 of Vogt et al. ("Vogt").

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-46 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites as follows:

A method of streaming a page of data, the method comprising:

allocating at least one object corresponding to the page of data, the page of data including one or more sub-components; and

executing the at least one object within a single request to an application server to provide the page, wherein, for each of the one or more sub-components, the executing comprises,

creating a proxy corresponding to the sub-component, the proxy representing a functionality of an object corresponding to the sub-component,

having the proxy to return the data corresponding to the sub-component to the at least one object if the corresponding data is in a cache memory without executing the object corresponding to the sub-component in order to obtain the data corresponding to the sub-component,

if the corresponding data is not in the cache memory, having the proxy to create the object corresponding to the sub-component to execute the object via a container associated with the object to generate the data corresponding to the sub-component, to return the generated data to the at least one object, and to store the data in the cache memory.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes limitations that in response to a single request, for each of the sub-components of a page, a proxy is created with the object corresponding to the page (e.g., a container object or a base agent object) and executed to obtain the data corresponding to the respective sub-component from a cache memory without having to executing the underlying

object associated with the sub-component (e.g., a component object), which is time-consuming. The underlying object associated with the sub-component is executed only if the data is not in the cache memory. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from the cited references, individually or in combination.

Rather, in order to cache a portion of a page, an application of the Kiva Document has to write each portion into a specific page, such as an AppLogic page, which requires to be submitted individually to an application server (e.g., multiple requests). See, for example, page 102 of the Kiva Document. Such multiple request processes involve high costs to the application server.

Although, pages 83-83 of Kiva mention an execute() method and page 15 of Kiva mentions a term of "request", Kiva still fails to disclose or suggest a single request being sent to an application server, where the single request contains a page having multiple sub-components and in response to the single request, the application server processes each of the sub-component. In contrast, the present invention as claimed independently performs caching for each sub-component within a single request to the application server. As a result, the start up processes of each request have been greatly reduced.

In addition, independent claim 1 further includes limitations of, for each of the sub-component, invoking a proxy representing an underlined object supporting the sub-component to determine whether the data corresponding to the sub-component is in a cache memory, and if so, the proxy returns the data (e.g., stream out) to the client without having to execute the underlying object associated with the sub-component. The underlined object is created and executed only when the data is absent from the cache memory and the output data is stored in the cache memory thereafter, as recited in claims 10 and 15, for example.

Thus, a container includes multiple component objects corresponding to each of the sub-components of the page. If the data associated with a sub-component is stored in a cache

memory, the proxy object is responsible for returning the data corresponding to that sub-component as long as the data is in the cache memory. Otherwise, the underlying object (e.g., the component object) is executed.

The Examiner contends that page 350 of Kiva discloses a proxy as claimed in the present application. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The “OBSession” referred by the Examiner is simply referred as a session proxy in a base class definition shown on page 350 of Kiva. The fact that page 350 of Kiva mentions the term of “proxy” does not necessarily mean that the references anticipates the limitations recited in claim 1, nor render them obvious. Specifically, there is no mention on page 350 of Kiva that a session proxy is used for each of the sub-components of a page to obtain data corresponding to the sub-component from the cache (e.g., one proxy for each sub-component).

Similarly, merely mentioning the term of “caching” in Kiva does not necessarily anticipate or render obvious, the limitations recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the fact that Yost merely mentions the term of a “container” does not necessarily suggest the usage of the container as claimed in the present application. In fact, there is no suggestion in Yost to use a container in a manner as claimed in the present application.

In order to render a claim as obvious, the cited references must teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in the claim. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the limitations set forth above. It is respectfully submitted that Vogt also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

It is respectfully submitted that KIVA and Yost do not teach or suggest a combination with each other. Even if KIVA and Yost were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above.

Similarly, independent claims 20 and 24-28 include similar limitations of claim 1. Thus, for reason similar to those discussed above, independent claims 20 and 24-28 are patentable over the cited references.

Given that claims 2-19, 21-23, and 29-46 depend from one of the above independent claims 1, 20, and 28, applicants submit that claims 2-19, 21-23, and 29-46 are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date:

6/1/2004



Kevin G. Shao
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300